



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/824,662

04/14/2004

Dany Sylvain

7000-339

7528

27820 7590 01/31/2011
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.
100 REGENCY FOREST DRIVE
SUITE 160
CARY, NC 27518

EXAMINER

LU, ZHIYU

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/31/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/824,662	Applicant(s) SYLVAIN, DANY	
	Examiner ZHIYU LU	Art Unit 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7-11,13-20,23,25-29 and 31-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7-11,13-20,23,25-29 and 31-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/11/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejection on claims, applicant argued that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose establishing a first communication session via a first interface and establishing a second communication session via a second interface where both the first session and the second session have the same communication ID. Applicant then argued that Baba does not teach separate communication sessions established via separate interfaces though having the same communication ID.

However, the Examiner does not agree. First off, as presented in rejections, Dinkin teaches establishing separate communication sessions via separate interfaces. Although Dinkin does not disclose communication ID, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the usage of same communication ID in Dinkin because Dinkin teaches reestablishing in a conference call session the identity of the caller dropped off (column 5 lines 22-46). The conference call session obviously has its own communication ID, in order to identify the particular conference call with particular participants. Second off, Baba teaches using the same communication ID to identify first and second sessions when reestablishing connection to a call (column 5 lines 9-49, column 13 lines 46-59, column 15 lines 6-37), which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize usage in session reestablishment of Dinkin. Also, Baba teaches that the communication ID (session/call ID) is used by the network to identify a SIP

Art Unit: 2618

connection/session (column 8 lines 57-60), which obviously does not limit interface of mobile station because new/temporary IP address is assigned regardless interface remains the same. So, Dinkin in view of Baba do teach the argued limitation.

Thus, the rejections are proper and maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 14, 16-20, 23, 25-26, 32 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinkin (US Patent#6603965) in view of Ito et al.

(US2002/0072391), and Baba et al. (US Patent#7184418).

Regarding claim 1, Dinkin teaches a mobile terminal comprising:

a first interface in the mobile terminal (21 or 22 of Fig. 2) and adapted to facilitate communications with a wired connection to a service node (1 of Fig. 1, or SIP server, or HR, or VR, or any intermediate registration management server node) via a first communication network (4 or 3 of Fig. 1), wherein the first interface is adapted to coupled to the first communication network such that the wired connection is facilitated through the first interface (column 2 lines 36-46);

Art Unit: 2618

a second interface (antenna of Fig. 2) in the mobile terminal and adapted to facilitate communications using a wireless connection to the service node via a second communication network (2 of Fig. 1) where communications via the first interface are associated with a first address and communications via the second interface are associated with a second address (obvious as different interfaces have different hardware addresses and visiting software addresses); and

a control system (44 of Fig. 4) operatively associated with the first and second interfaces and adapted to:

select the first interface for establishing a first session for a communication over the first communication network, when the wired connection via the first interface is available (column 4 line 62 to column 5 line 1);

establish the first session for the communication via the first interface, the first session identified with a communication ID (obvious in column 3 lines 46-56);

determine that communications via the first interface will no longer be possible (column 2 lines 47-49);

initiate and establish a second session for the communication with an entity via the second interface, the second session identified with the communication ID (obvious in column 3 lines 46-56);

register with the service node in association with the first address when the wired connection via the first interface is available (obvious in registering with conference room, Fig. 1); and

Art Unit: 2618

register with the service node in association with the second address prior to the wired connection via the first interface becoming unavailable (obvious in using a secondary/standby link when the primary link becomes unavailable, column 2 lines 51-57, especially when both connections may exist concurrently, column 4 lines 5-13 & 59-61).

But, Dinkin does not expressly disclose establishing second connection is in response to the determination that communications via the first interface will no longer be possible; and such that both the first session and the second session have the communication ID.

Itoh et al. teach a wireless terminal having a plurality of communication adapters (e.g., wireless, wired; Fig. 1, paragraphs 0005-0013), wherein more than one communication adapter can be enabled (paragraph 0015), such that enabling a communication adapter to be enabled in response to a predetermined condition of depression of a predetermined key (paragraph 0016), which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that a user may initiate a second connection (e.g. wired) in response to deciding upcoming disconnection from a first connection (e.g. wireless) and incorporate into the apparatus of Dinkin for providing flexible communication connection and switching capability.

Baba et al. teach a mobility management using a SIP server to forward IP packet to designated mobile node while monitoring the connection environment of the mobile node associated with (column 5 lines 9-49), wherein the session ID remains the same with temporary IP address changes if mobile node changes connection environment (column 13 lines 46-59, column 15 lines 6-37). Baba et al. teach registering with a service node (DHCP, SIP server, HR, or VR) when roaming among networks (Figs. 3-10, column 3 line 19 to column 6 line 26), and

Art Unit: 2618

having a mobility management assigning a mobile terminal a personal identifier, which is for association from session to session (e.g. first temporary IP address to second temporary IP address) when moving from one network into another (column 5 lines 9-31), which comprises soft hand-off (column 13 lines 11-19) such as establishing a second connection in response of determining upcoming disconnection of a first connection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate registering communication link with a service node and having the same communication ID association with different session taught by Baba et al. into the mobile terminal of Dinkin and Ito et al., in order to provide a persist connection with the service node.

Regarding claim 19, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach a method as explained in response to claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19

Dinkin teaches the control system is further adapted to determine if the wired connection via the first interface is available (303 of Fig. 3).

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 4 and 22.

Art Unit: 2618

Dinkin teaches the control system is further adapted to register with the service node in association with the second address when the wired connection via the first interface is not available (column 2 lines 46-49).

Regarding claims 7 and 25, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 4 and 22.

Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the control system is further adapted to register with the service node in association with the second address prior to initiating local wireless communications via the second interface (column 5 lines 9-31 of Baba et al.).

Regarding claims 8 and 26, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 3 and 22.

Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the control system is further adapted to obtain the first address after detecting an ability to communicate via the first interface, and obtain the second address after detecting an ability to communicate via the second interface (column 5 lines 9-31 of Baba et al.).

Regarding claims 14 and 32, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach determining communications via the first interface will no longer be possible, the control system is adapted to detect being removed from being directly coupled to the first communication network (column 2 lines 47-49 of Dinkin).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claims 16 and 34, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the control system is further adapted to: determine communications via the first interface are available (column 2 lines 47-49 of Dinkin); and initiate and establish a third session for the communication with the entity via the first interface, the third session for the communication identified with the communication ID (column 2 lines 47-49 of Dinkin, column 5 lines 9-31 of Baba et al.).

Regarding claims 17 and 35, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Baba et al. teaches the first session is associated with the first address for the mobile terminal and the second session is associated with the second address for the mobile terminal (column 5 lines 9-49, column 13 lines 46-59, column 15 lines 6-37).

Regarding claims 18 and 36, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Dinkin teaches comprising providing a cellular interface operatively associated with the control system to facilitate cellular communications (column 4 lines 33-38).

Regarding claims 37-38, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitation of claims 1 and 19.

Art Unit: 2618

Baba et al. teach wherein SIP call signaling is used during signaling with the service node (Fig. 6).

3. Claims 9-11, 13, 15, 27-29, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinkin (US Patent#6603965) in view of Ito et al. (US2002/0072391), Baba et al. (US Patent#7184418), and Amos (US2004/0259544).

Regarding claims 9 and 27, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Amos teaches the first interface is a docking interface adapted to couple to a docking station, which connects to the first communication network such that the wired connection is facilitated through the docking station (paragraphs 0033, 0035), which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement into the mobile terminal of Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. by design preference.

Regarding claims 10 and 28, Dinkin, Ito et al., Baba et al., and Amos teach the limitations of claims 9 and 27.

Dinkin, Ito et al., Baba et al., and Amos teach the first interface further comprises a network interface coupled to the docking interface (22 of Fig. 2 of Dinkin).

Regarding claims 11 and 29, Dinkin, Ito et al., Baba et al., and Amos teach the limitations of claims 9 and 27.

Art Unit: 2618

Amos teaches the docking station comprises a network interface (210 of Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 13 and 31, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19

Dinkin, Ito et al., Baba et al., and Amos teach determining communications via the first interface will no longer be possible (column 2 lines 47-49 of Dinkin), the control system is adapted to detect being removed from a docking station as explained in response to claims 9 and 27 above (Fig. 5 of Amos).

Regarding claims 15 and 33, Dinkin, Ito et al., and Baba et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Dinkin, Ito et al., Baba et al. and Amos teach determining communications via the first interface will no longer be possible, the control system is adapted to detect a signal sent from a docking station (as explained in response to claims 9 and 27 above), which is coupled to the first communication network and coupled to the mobile terminal (column 2 lines 47-49 of Dinkin).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2618

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZHIYU LU whose telephone number is (571)272-2837. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays: 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Zhiyu Lu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2618

Application/Control Number: 10/824,662

Page 12

Art Unit: 2618

/Zhiyu Lu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

January 24, 2011